



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/532,977 | 04/28/2005 | Lily Ka-Lai Cheng | 120270.129854 | 3081 |

28440 7590 08/18/2009
WARNER, NORCROSS & JUDD
IN RE: ALTICOR INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
111 LYON STREET, N. W. STE 900
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49503-2489

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

TORRES RUIZ, JOHALI ALEJANDRA

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2858

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

08/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/532,977 | Applicant(s) CHENG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner JOHALI A. TORRES RUIZ | Art Unit 2858 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JOHALI A. TORRES RUIZ. (3) Charles E. Burpee (29,776).

(2) Richard V. Muralidar. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: _____.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: 8/12/2009.

Claim(s) discussed: 41 and 78-80.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sabo et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,803,744) and Matsuda et al. (U.S. Publication Number 2002/0018025).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that there was no teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine Sabo and Matsuda. In response to this argument it was stated that the references could not be combined because they were not analogous art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|---|--|
| /Johali A Torres Ruiz/ Examiner, Art Unit 2858 | |
|---|--|